UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,737	07/21/2006	Ikuya Miyamoto	1830.1024	1658
Staas & Halsey	7590 03/25/200	EXAMINER		
1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor			PEPITONE, MICHAEL F	
Washington, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/586,737	MIYAMOTO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MICHAEL PEPITONE	1796
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated and the period for reply will by stated and the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated and the period for reply will. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of the pr	EDATE OF THIS COMMUNICATED AND A 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply it will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS atute, cause the application to become ABANE	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) T 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matters	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5 and 7</u> is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are witho 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5 and 7</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. rection is required if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Burn * See the attached detailed Office action for a light	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appl riority documents have been rec eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 12/24/08 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 11/662,197 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokida *et al.* (JP-2003261695) in view of Takahashi *et al.* (US 6,238,793). For the purpose of examination, the machine translation of Enokida *et al.* (JP-2003261695) was used.

Regarding claims 1-3: Enokida *et al.* teaches a composite material (\P 6) comprising a sheet silicate organically modified with an onium salt (\P 14-17), specifically dihydroxyethyl methyl ocatadecyl ammonium salt [instant claims 2-3] (\P 16), in an amount of 0.1 to 1 wt% (\P 8); and polyethylene glycol dispersibilty improvers {non-ionic surfactants} (\P 19) in an amount of .001 to 1 wt% (\P 20).

Enokida *et al.* does not teach polyoxyethylene alkyl ether surfactants. However, Takahashi *et al.* teaches a thermoplastic composites comprising lamellar silicates (1:10-24) and non-ionic surfactants {polyethyleneglycol oleyl ether, degree of polymerization $n=2\sim50$; alkyl group = C_{18} ; polyethyleneglycol lauryl ether, degree of polymerization $n=2\sim50$; alkyl group = C_{12} } (3:55-65). Enokida *et al.* and Takahashi *et al.* are analogous art because they are concerned with a similar technical difficulty, namely the preparation thermoplastic composites comprising silicates and non-ionic surfactants. At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have combined polyethyleneglycol alkyl ethers {degree of polymerization $n=2\sim50$; alkyl group = C_{12} - C_{18} }, as taught by Takahashi *et al.* in the invention of Enokida *et al.*, and would have been motivated to do so since Takahashi *et al.* suggests that such non-ionic surfactants do not require dispersion/dissolution in media such as water (eliminating a separate process step for water removal} (3:42-51).

Regarding claims 5 and 7: Enokida *et al.* teaches a polylactic acid [instant claims 5-6] (¶ 7-8) biaxially oriented {stretched} film [instant claim 7] (¶ 6, 43-44).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1796

Enokida *et al.* (JP '695) was relied on for a composite material (\P 6) comprising a sheet silicate organically modified with an onium salt (\P 14-17), specifically dihydroxyethyl methyl ocatadecyl ammonium salts [instant claims 2-3] (\P 16), in an amount of 0.1 to 1 wt% (\P 8); and polyethylene glycol dispersibilty improvers {non-ionic surfactants} (\P 19) in an amount of .001 to 1 wt% (\P 20).

Takahashi *et al.* (US '793) was relied on for a thermoplastic composites comprising lamellar silicates (1:10-24) and non-ionic surfactants {polyethyleneglycol oleyl ether, degree of polymerization $n=2\sim50$; alkyl group = C_{18} ; polyethyleneglycol lauryl ether, degree of polymerization $n=2\sim50$; alkyl group = C_{12} } (3:55-65).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/586,737 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PEPITONE whose telephone number is (571)270-

3299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MFP

20-March-09

/Harold Y Pyon/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit

1796